



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/560,109	01/17/2006	Calin Turcanu	P1712US00	2893
36671 7590 03/02/2010 DITTHAVONG MORI & STEINER, P.C. 918 Prince Street Alexandria, VA 22314				
EXAMINER LAM, DUNG LE				
ART UNIT 2617		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 03/02/2010		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docket@dcpatent.com

<b><i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i></b>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 2px;">Application No. 10/560,109</td> <td style="width: 50%; padding: 2px;">Applicant(s) TURCANU, CALIN</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="padding: 2px;">Examiner DUNG LAM</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">Art Unit 2617</td> </tr> </table>	Application No. 10/560,109	Applicant(s) TURCANU, CALIN	Examiner DUNG LAM	Art Unit 2617
Application No. 10/560,109	Applicant(s) TURCANU, CALIN				
Examiner DUNG LAM	Art Unit 2617				

**All Participants:**  
 (1) DUNG LAM.  
 (2) Jennifer Teng.

**Date of Interview:** 22 February 2010

**Type of Interview:**  
☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant    ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:**    ☐ Yes    ☐ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:  
*The amended limitations of claim 1 was discussed.*

Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  
*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/VINCENT P. HARPER/  
 Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

The examiner called the attorney to clarify the meaning and where the amended limitation "deleting the user's selection of the ad-hoc group from the phonebook" is supported in the specification. The attorney referred the examiner to Figure 4 and 5 and stated that since the group was customized selected from the phonebook, the deletion of the custom built ad hoc group would imply the deletion of the selection to one of ordinary skill in the art..